

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 remain pending, claims 3 and 7 being independent. In this reply, Applicant has amended claims 3 and 4 to address the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. This rejection insofar as it pertains to the pending claims, is traversed. Although the Examiner identifies claim 1 as being the rejected claim, claim 1 is not currently pending and Applicant assumes that the rejection has been made against independent claim 3. If this assumption is incorrect, however, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner clarify the grounds for rejection.

In reply to the Examiner's indication that the claimed invention is unclear for reciting a "display means" for reading digital image data, Applicant has amended claim 3 to recite a "reading unit" for reading digital image data, and has further specified that it is a "display" that displays an image which represents digital image data that has been read. Dependent claim 4 has been amended for consistency with claim 3.

In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**Prior Art Rejection**

Claims 3, 4, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being anticipated by *Timmermans* (USP 5,633,726). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 3 is directed to a reproduction apparatus comprising: a reading unit for reading digital image data from a recording medium on which the digital image data, data representing the size of a full image and data representing the size of an effective image have been stored in mutually correlated form; a display for displaying an image which represents the digital image data that has been read; and aspect altering means responsive to an entered aspect alteration command for rewriting the data representing the size of the effective image, which data has been recorded on the recording medium, by new data representing an instructed size for the effective image.

Independent claim 7 is directed to a reproduction apparatus comprising: readout means for reading data out of a recording medium on which digital image data, data representing the size of a full image and data representing the size of an effective image have been stored in mutually correlated form; manipulating means

for manipulating the digital image data, which has been read out by said readout means, to image data representing an image having an aspect ratio stipulated by the data representing the size of the effective image; and display means for displaying the image represented by the image data manipulated by said manipulating means.

As discussed in the Reply dated April 3, 2003 providing data representing the size of the full image in mutually correlated form with corresponding digital image data and data representing the size of an effective image is significant because, in accordance with embodiments of the present invention, an image with a desired aspect ratio, indicated by the effective image size (e.g., length A and width B) may be generated from the full image (e.g., length X and width Y) without limiting the ability to later revert back to the full image size or an image of intermediate size. Regardless of how the effective image size is altered in accordance with aspect altering commands, the full image data and information indicating the size of the full image is maintained for future use.

The Examiner asserts, on page 3 of the Office Action, that the applied reference, *Timmermans*, discloses the use of "control codes," which represent the size of the effective image, allowing for different aspect ratios. Applicant submits, however, that *Timmermans* does not disclose that the size of the full image is

also stored on the recoding medium in mutually correlated form with data representing the size of an effective image, as claimed. With reference to column 22, lines 33-35, *Timmermans* states that a perimeter frame is bounded by column, row addresses of four corners. This column, row address information, however, neither teaches nor suggests data representing the size of a full image, which according to the present invention is recorded on the recording medium in correlated form with data representing the size of an effective image.

Furthermore, in claim 3, data representing the size an effective image is rewritten by new data representing an instructed size for the effective image. In claim 7, the digital image data is manipulated to image data representing an image having an aspect ratio stipulated by the data representing the size of the effective image. Thus, the data representing the size of the effective image is used for changing the aspect ratio of an image represented by the digital image data, which does not result in modification or correction on the full image itself. In contrast, as evident from Figs. 27 and 28, *Timmermans* modifies/corrects the image itself to change the aspect ratio. For example, the height of the image object in Fig. 27 is reduced as shown in Fig. 28 (in which the aspect ratio is changed). Therefore, *Timmermans* discloses modification/correction of the image itself, as further evidenced,

for example at column 22, lines 52-53, stating "performing a 5/6 demagnification of the full horizontal picture."

At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

**Conclusion**


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact D. Richard Anderson (Reg. No. 40,439) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) respectfully petition(s) for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$950.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP



By

D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

DRA/lab  
0905-0225P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000